

The present crisis in British
Guyana reveals a fundamental
flaw in the constitution of the
country. Quite simply the Act
has been passed by a Parlia-
mentary majority which has
touched off the biggest strike
action the country has ever seen.
Since it is likely that other
important acts passed by similar
Parliamentary majorities will produce
similar crises - it is time to
call in question this system
of doing important things by
~~mere~~ Parliamentary majority only.

Our ^{present} Constitution has been derived
on the British model - but I
think that the atmosphere of
suspicion prevailing in this country
makes such a constitution ~~un-
suitable~~ unsuitable.

We need a new kind of constitution
~~in the first place~~ - one which
merges the British Parliamentary
system of majority Party rule with
a system by which more unanimity
on big issues can be secured. Let
me show you what I mean.

In the first place - in the interests of

national unity - I feel that no am-
stitution should come into force unless
it has the assent of $\frac{2}{3}$ of the people
elected representatives OR of the
people themselves.

Secondly such a constitution
should divide the issues to be
settled under it into two - Important
issues than can be settled by
the ordinary practice of Parliamentary
majority - the British system. And

But other issues - those which
will cause serious disturbance
in the coming should be raised to
the level of constitutional issues.

By this I mean that they should
be settled in the same way the
constitution would have been
settled by a two-thirds ma-
jority of the Legislative Body.

Under this second consideration
of ~~an~~ a Bill passed by
a normal Parliamentary majority
would need resistance, strikes,
or civil disobedience then it

means that the Bill must be
regarded as a constitutional
issue. The Legislative Assembly
then turns it up into a consti-
tutional convention - the way that

the Bill must receive a two-thirds
vote comes into force and when

the Bill ^{in its amended form} is passed it has the support
of two thirds of the Assembly and
hence the threat of civil disobedience
will disappear. Such a
method of procedure ~~will~~ would
save B.C. from a hero's coat.

It will mean that ^{an} government
must recognize that some issues
are too big for them alone to
handle - and minorities will have
a fair measure of participation.
After all Democracy ~~cannot~~
live on the basis of outraged
minorities if it does it must
be carried by another man.

Good Evening,

One thing is clear: that among the men who reach those lovely pinnacles in human affairs Pope John XXIII has been one of the most impressive. Why the world is asking has an old man who was Pope for only four years has made such an impact? The answers are that he was a peasant, ^{that} he was humorous and ^{that} humble; and he was delightfully informal. All of them find answers in their way. But I don't think they really touch the heart of the matter.

Pope John, to my mind or best, appeared to millions of non-Roman Catholics like myself because of two qualities: He lived with his times and he was a man of dialogue.

Let's look at the first quality: this remarkably contemporary personality. Pope John brought a

wind change through the structure
of the Roman Catholic Church.

Bishops found for the first time in
that ~~confusion~~ ^{disarray} that a great deal
more power ~~has~~ ^{has} been put in their
hands. In fact Pope John seemed
very keen on de-centralising
the Church. But far more dynamic
than this he took an enthusiastic
interest in the New Nations of
Asia & Africa & in their problems &
ideals and concerned it as the
function of this Church to assist
~~both in the~~ in their development
& to adapt itself to their culture.
But nothing showed his realistic
approach to the 20th Century than
his advocacy of peaceful coexistence
you see this angle for Mr Nehru
to advocate peaceful coexistence
because he doesn't have to bother
with the philosophical aspects of it -
but when a Pope does so it means
much more than
merely a comfortable diplomatic
device.

And this brings me to the second
of Pope John's great qualities - his
interest in dialogue. What do I mean
by dialogue? Simply this: a desire

~~to get behind words~~ to establish contact
with those who differ from you by going
beyond the words you use to express your
differences. He seemed to have realized
that the words Catholic, Protestant,
Communist, Democrat, Fascist,
Bourgeois and all the rest of them
were often words ~~which~~ blocked
human appreciation of human problems.
And so he set about to get behind
the words & formulas to the deeper
meanings - down to the fundamentals
to see if when men get so far they
do not find that they misunderstand
each others positions. And to my
mind this is precisely what our
country & our country (if you want
to be more precise) need. We are
all locked in formulas and
imprisoned in text-books. And
instead of ~~the~~ establishing del-
egate we have perjurative adjunction.
It is to Pope John's credit that
he begged men to get behind
loaded words and text-book
definitions to ~~real~~ contact with
men of different outlooks. We
could do with a few men of
Pope John's approach in B. G.

One thing is certain: that among the men who reach those lonely pinnacles in human affairs Pope John XXIII has been one of the most impressive. Popes are always popular among Roman Catholics - this is only natural. But when a Pope appeals in the way John did, to men of all faiths and to men of no faith, obviously one must begin to enquire into the magic of his personality.

It has been suggested that the Pope was so popular because he was a peasant. But I don't think this carries us very far. Had he been a deeply conservative Pope, had he held on rigidly to an old fashioned Catholicism no peasant origins would have made the slightest notice to him.

~~His humor and humility~~ Others suggest that his appeal lay in his humor and humility. I think there is more weight in this one - though again I doubt whether these qualities would have carried his impact further than his own

church. If it had not been for
~~two~~ ^{two} gifts he possessed. ~~and it is~~
~~this quality which to my mind~~
~~expresses his appeal - Pope~~
~~John the real appeal lay in~~
~~two gifts he possessed - the~~
~~gift of keeping his ear to the~~
~~ground and the gift of being able~~
~~to break down barriers.~~

He had an extra ordinary sense
of what the twentieth century needs.
In fact the ^{his} timeliness is
a great part of his late impact he
made. Some men are too much in
advance of their age: some too
far behind. Pope John was right
on the beam. The rising new nations
of Africa & Asia found in him
a warm enthusiast. He was keenly
interested in their problems and what
is significant ready to adapt the
traditions of his Church to their
needs and ideas. But perhaps
he showed his timeliness nowhere better
than in his plea for peaceful co-existence
between East & West - an
extraordinary plea for a Pope who
unlike Mr. Nehru, he cannot think
in political terms only.

One thing is certain: that among the men who reach those lonely pinnacles in human affairs Pope John XXIII has been one of the most impressive. Popes were always popular among their Roman Catholic subjects. But when a Pope appears, in the way John did, to Protestants, Muslims, Hindus men of all faiths and men of no faith obviously one must begin to enquire into the magic of his personality.

It is been said that Pope John XXIII was so popular because he was a peasant. This assessment has some weight in a century when the common man has come to the forefront. To have a pope who was brothers still toiling in the fields establishing a strong link with the masses of humanity the world over - and particularly in the under developed countries - who work with their hands. But peasants can be the most conservative of men. And if Pope John was merely a peasant with an old fashioned Roman Catholic outlook the secular century would surely have bowed him by.

This is not the real reason for the his
impact.

Others say that the Pope won the
hearts of millions by his humorous
humility. He would be disturbingly
unfamiliar - disturbing, that is, to the
members of the Vatican who believed in
pompous. But humor & humility
might have made him a popular
person. The poor men would have
loved him and the world would have
approved of him. But approval is one thing.
~~High commendation~~ The sort of
likability that men have made to him is
more than just approval. They imply
that the man had a way of transcending
any barriers. And this, I think is the
ultimate source of his appeal.

Pope John was beloved in a dialogue.
And by dialogue I don't mean just
conversation between two people who differ.
What he wanted to do is to get behind the
words to the deeper meanings to see just
how far he could go along.

